## COURT RESPONSES TO VENDOR QUESTIONS RFP 06-06-01 IVR

7/27/06

- QUESTION: Page 7, Mandatory Operational Requirements, "Ability to queue callers" Does this indicate that the IVR system should be able to queue callers waiting to speak to an operator after requesting to be transferred from the IVR script? If so, it would appear that this would be done by an ACD. Does the Court currently have an ACD capability or would the Court like an ACD function to be included with the proposed IVR system?
  - ➤ COURT RESPONSE: The court does not have ACD capability nor is it a requirement of this proposal. It is anticipated that only one line will be available to process queued calls. Vendors are free to propose optional solutions.
- QUESTION: Page 7, Optional Operational Requirements, "Screen Popping" Is the screen popping function to be implemented in conjunction with an ACD function? If so, would the Court like the proposed system to include the ACD capability?
  - ➤ COURT RESPONSE: ACD is not required. Vendors are free to propose optional solutions.
- ❖ QUESTION: Page 7, Hardware Requirements, "Rack mount must not exceed 2U 1U preferred" Is there a space limitation driving this requirement. A 2U server will limit the future expansion capability of the IVR system. A 1U server would not lend itself to accommodating the voice processing modules required by the Court's current telephone system. Does the Court have a preference or requirement for the manufacturer of the server hardware?
  - ➤ COURT RESPONSE: Yes, there is a current space limitation driving the hardware requirement, however, if you feel the proposal would be best with another configuration, please note so the court may consider. The court is standardized on Hewlett Packard; however, there is no requirement for the manufacturer of the server hardware in this proposal.
- \* QUESTION: Does the Court currently have a website operational, and if so, is it interested in having interactive web response capability proposed with the IVR system?
  - ➤ COURT RESPONSE: Yes http://www.calaveras.courts.ca.gov/. Web Interface is included on the bid pricing sheet under optional features.
- QUESTION: What is the maximum cost the Court has budgeted for the procurement of this IVR system?
   COURT RESPONSE: A maximum cost has not been established.
- ❖ QUESTION: Is a Microsoft Word version of the RFP available to assist vendors in preparing their responses to the RFP?
  - > COURT RESPONSE: Yes. Contact Dick Howard at <a href="mailto:dhoward@calaveras.courts.ca.gov">dhoward@calaveras.courts.ca.gov</a> for a copy.
- QUESTION: The RFP contains a large number of specific technical questions (approximately 150). It appears many of them are not applicable to the Jury application and its environment that is specified. Others refer to technology that is no longer current. Since answering this type of questions requires a vendor to spend significant amounts of technical staff time to respond in its proposal, would it be possible for the Court to review this list of questions and possibly reduce it to those that directly apply to system and current technology? This will not only encourage more vendors to respond to the RFP, but will reduce the amount of time the Court evaluation committee will need to spend in comparing bidder's answers to this large number of questions.
  - Vendors are encouraged to provide as much information as possible to assist the court in evaluating the responses and the product proposed. However, if a question does not appear to be applicable, it is acceptable to indicate that. Vendors may also include responses to multiple questions within one narrative so long as the question numbers corresponding to the narrative are identified.

- The third item in section 3.1 (Specifications) states that the IVR solution must provide the capability for jurors to change their name and address. To meet this requirement, would the Court consider a solution that provided a special menu option for jurors to change their name and address but then have this option transfer jurors to the Jury Administration staff to actually complete the name and address changes?
  - COURT RESPONSE: A solution that requires jury administration staff to participate in the change of name and address would not meet the objectives or specification.
- ❖ QUESTION: Section 2.4.2 mentions the Court's plans to move to a VoIP switch within the next two years. Does the Court intend to include the capability of providing analog stations as a requirement for the new switch?
  - COURT RESPONSE: No.
- QUESTION: Does the proposed system need to run under Windows 2003 Server or would Windows XP Professional be sufficient to meet the Court's hardware platform requirements for the voice response system?
  - ➤ COURT RESPONSE: Vendors are free to propose solutions they feel will meet requirements of the RFP and needs of the Court. The Court will evaluate all proposals accordingly.
- ❖ QUESTION: The Bid Price Sheet (Attachment "E") includes a line item under "Optional Items" for Case Management System expandability. Since the vendor is still in the process of developing IVR and IWR interface specifications for CMS, it isn't possible to quote an actual price for CMS add-on modules at this time. Would it be sufficient at this point just to state that our IVR platform can support the development of CMS interfaces, and leave this line item as "TBD" as far as the pricing is concerned?
  - > COURT RESPONSE: Response to Optional Features and pricing are left to the Vendor's discretion.
- QUESTION: In section 4.4 (Response Content) bidders are advised that they can submit their Dunn & Bradstreet report in lieu of an Annual Report. As a small, privately-held LLC, we don't issue an Annual Report and the cost to send you a copy of our Dunn & Bradstreet report would be \$300, which is beyond our budget for this RFP. Would a copy of our latest fiscal year financial statements be sufficient to meet this general requirement?
  - COURT RESPONSE: All Vendors are encouraged to submit their responses in accordance with para.

    4.4. Failure to do so may result in you response being disqualified as non-responsive.